



**APPROVED** Minutes of the **ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD** held on Tuesday, January 20, 2015, in the Public Meeting Room of the Village Hall, One Olde Half Day Road, Lincolnshire, IL.

**PRESENT:** Chairman Grover, Members Gulatee, Hardnock, and Kennerley.

**ABSENT:** Trustee Liaison McDonough.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Steve McNellis, Community & Economic Development Director, Stephen Robles, Village Planner, and Tonya Zozulya, Economic Development Coordinator.

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Grover called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

### **1.0 ROLL CALL**

The roll was called by **Village Planner Robles** and **Chairman Grover** declared a quorum to be present.

### **2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2.1 Approval of the Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Architectural Review Board held Monday, November 3, 2014.

**Member Hardnock** moved and **Member Kennerley** seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the special meeting of the Architectural Review Board held on November 3, 2014, as presented. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

### **3.0 ITEMS OF GENERAL BUSINESS:**

Prior to the opening of Item 3.1, **Village Planner Robles** requested the ARB open Item 3.2 for consideration and discussion prior to Item 3.1, due to the number of audience members present for 3.2. The Petitioner of Item 3.1 consented to placing their request second on the Agenda. **Chairman Grover** accepted Staff's request and opened Item 3.2.

3.2 Consideration and Discussion of site plan, building elevations, building materials and colors, landscape plan, rooftop equipment plan, and site lighting for an expansion of church facilities at 1207 Riverwoods Road (Ascension Of Our Lord Greek Orthodox Church).

**Village Planner Robles** presented that in 2008, the Ascension of Our Lord Greek Orthodox Church proposed a 46,000-square foot church facility, with new administration offices, education wing, and a multi-purpose Parish Life Center. That proposal had been withdrawn and the Church submitted a new application and site development plan. The proposed expansion plans were a significant departure from the prior, as the Church had assessed their current and future needs and found they



required less space than previously proposed.

**Village Planner Robles** continued, that based on Staff's review of the presentation packet, he would like to call the ARB's attention to specific items of the proposal. A vehicular drop-off area is proposed along the frontage of the new church addition. While the drop-off area footprint had been reduced, the 25' diameter circular planter bed appeared to contribute to the size of this area. As a result, Staff questioned if the proposed planter bed should be removed to further reduce the circular turn-around footprint and create added planting space along Riverwoods Road. With the removal, the turnaround area can be defined by flush brick pavers or similar pavement treatment to define vehicle circulation.

He continued, the new Church design continued elements of traditional Byzantine style architecture, similar to the previous proposal. However, the stone base material and the overall color scheme had been revised to subdued shades of natural whites and grays. A result of the revised building design is a significant amount of E.I.F.S. material, which the Village traditionally strived to limit to a secondary accent material, rather than a primary material. **Village Planner Robles** noted that while an entire replacement of E.I.F.S. was not necessary, Staff recommended reducing its use within the overall building elevations. The Church had also elected to replace the previously proposed red-tile roof shingles with asphalt shingles and standing seam pre-finished aluminum roof for the dome. The ARB should consider the finish color of the aluminum roof to determine the potential for glare was properly addressed.

**Village Planner Robles** noted that at the request of Staff, the Church had added accent berming along Riverwoods Road. However, one foot tall berms were proposed in the attached Landscape Plan, which did not satisfy Staff's request. The maximum height of the berms should increase to at least 2' in height, with varying heights up to 3' in small areas, to provide visual interest. Secondly, the plantings used to screen the vehicular drop-off area did not include any evergreen varieties, which would not effectively screen during the winter season. The landscape plan should be revised to include a variety of seasonal trees/shrubs, including evergreens, to provide year-round screening of the drop-off area. Lastly, **Village Planner Robles** identified the proposed landscape plant list and plan were absent of any native grasses, which are routinely requested of Staff.

**Village Planner Robles** concluded by noting Staff was recommending approval of the proposed development plans, subject to the four conditions stated in the memo.

**Michael Firsel** of Firsel Ross, as attorney for the Ascension of Our Lord Greek Orthodox Church, provided a brief history of the prior Church proposals and neighborhood meetings that have been held prior to the ARB meeting. From the previous proposal, the Village Board directed the Church to 1) move the building as far north on the property as possible, 2) address the parking demand of the expansion, which the new proposal provided parking 40% above Village Code, and 3) revise the building design to blend more with the surrounding neighborhood and Village character. **Mr. Firsel** also noted the Church will be annexing the adjoining lot



to the south, which will allow for the Church to remain compliant with the maximum 30% impervious surface area, and remain vacant as a result.

**David Kuhlman**, President of JNKA Architects, presented the evolution of the changes to the Church's expansion plans from the initial submittal. **Mr. Kuhlman** clarified the landscape plan had been revised to provide two foot tall landscape berms, as requested by Staff. He continued, the existing one-story Church building façade would be refinished to match the proposed expansion, including new roofing shingles and modified windows to include the arch design. **Member Gulatee** questioned the proposed stone was a cast stone material. **Mr. Kuhlman** clarified the stone would be a face stone. **Member Kennerley** inquired as to the life expectancy of the face stone material and any need for increased maintenance. **Mr. Kuhlman** explained the proposed stone was no different than a standard stone.

**Mr. Kuhlman** continued and explained the proposed E.I.F.S. use comprised no more than 33% of the total façade. **Member Gulatee** questioned the architect's support for the proposed E.I.F.S. **Mr. Kuhlman** explained the building materials were selected with respect to the Church's budget and provide texture and design to the buildings. He continued, the design was a balance of economics and aesthetics. **Member Gulatee** noted the US Post Office in the Village is also E.I.F.S. and in his observation, was not very durable. **Mr. Kuhlman** expressed the installation of such material has been improved to include adequate drainage to prevent mold on the surface, which was characteristic of previous generations of E.I.F.S. **Member Hardnock** questioned if there were any expansion seams with E.I.F.S. surfaces. **Mr. Kuhlman** confirmed there would be expansion joints, but were not reflected on the elevations and renderings in the packet. **Mr. Firsel** explained the Village's adoption of the International Building Code (IBC), permits E.I.F.S. and such will be installed in conformance with the standards and specifications of the Village Codes.

**Member Kennerley** sought clarification on the berming and the comment that two foot tall berms were proposed. **Kevin Manning**, Project Architect with JNKA Architects, explained the berms were proposed at two feet tall per Staff's request and noted the topography lines were difficult to see on the landscape plan. **Mr. Manning** further acknowledge the note of 1 foot typical berm height on the plan was confusing and did not match with the topography.

**Chairman Grover** returned to Staff recommendation #1 regarding decreasing the vehicular circular turn-around area. **Mr. Firsel** responded that they will work with Staff to make the area smaller, if possible. **Mr. Kuhlman** interjected and noted the engineered design of the turn-around circle is as small as possible, but they will review. **Chairman Grover** questioned if Staff was accepting of the petitioner's proposal. **Village Planner Robles** explained that despite Staff requesting the reduction during preliminary review, it was never conveyed to Staff that the design was engineered at the tightest turning radii possible. If no further reduction is possible, Staff had not been provided any information or documentation to confirm such.



Continuing with Staff recommendation #4, **Chairman Grover** sought the petitioner's willingness to work with Staff regarding additional enhancements to the proposed landscape plan. **Mr. Firsel** concurred.

**Chairman Grover** proceeded to Item #2 of the Staff recommendation regarding a reduction in the use of E.I.F.S. **Mr. Firsel** presented a variety of commercial and residential buildings in Lincolnshire which incorporate E.I.F.S. as the primary building material, and the Church proposal was in keeping with such. **Mr. Firsel** further noted that the proposed E.I.F.S. was clearly consistent with other R1 structures. **Member Gulatee** expressed his disagreement and explained the Church was not a private home.

**Member Gulatee** noted the existing parking field of 92 spaces east of the proposed addition and only a single entry door proposed at the rear of the Church for these spaces, and recommended a double-entry door be used in its place. **Mr. Firsel** concurred.

There was as consensus amongst the ARB that the proposed expansion was an improvement over the previous proposal and supportive of the 33% E.I.F.S. coverage of the building façade.

There being no further comment, **Chairman Grover** sought a motion for ARB consideration.

*Member Hardnock moved and Member Gulatee seconded a motion to approve and recommend to the Village Board for their approval of the site plan, building elevations, building materials and colors, landscape plan, rooftop equipment plan, and site lighting for the expansion of new facilities for the Ascension of Our Lord Greek Orthodox Church located at 1207 Riverwoods Road, subject to the following:*

1. *Reduction in the scale of the circular vehicle drop-off area to the minimal extent possible, without compromising emergency access and safety.*
2. *Increase the maximum height of berming along Riverwoods Road to at least 2' in height, with varying heights up to 3' in small areas, to provide visual interest.*
3. *Revise the landscape plan, as follows:*
  - a. *Include a variety of seasonal trees/shrubs, including evergreen trees/shrubs, to provide year-round screening of the vehicular drop-off area from Riverwoods Road.*
  - b. *Incorporate native grasses along Riverwoods Road and along building foundation planting areas.*

*The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.*

- 3.1 Consideration and Discussion of amendments to the site plan, building elevations, and landscape plan approved by Special Use Ordinance 78-533-23 for a proposed U-Haul facility (Amerco Real Estate Company).

**Village Planner Robles** presented Staff's memorandum and explained that Amerco Real Estate Company represents U-Haul who is under contract to purchase 200



Industrial Drive for a U-Haul self-storage and truck rental facility. In 1978, the property received a Special Use to permit truck sales and repair, for indoor operations only. The existing single-story metal building was constructed to accommodate truck repair, with individual repair/service bays. On-site landscaping is limited to an existing 6-foot tall landscaped berm fronting Aptakisic Road. Due to the industrial nature of the property, most of the site is surfaced with gravel, with an area of asphalt along the front of the building. Two existing detached structures associated with the current use of the property were also identified on the site plan.

**Village Planner Robles** summarized Staff's recommendations, noting the vehicle area north of the building should be paved with concrete, asphalt or similar materials to comply with the Off-Street Parking regulations and that the existing detached structures are removed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. In addition, fourteen truck rental spaces will front Aptakisic Road for street exposure. **Village Planner Robles** clarified Staff did not object to the location and number of rental spaces, but recommended the spaces are revised to 90° orientation, perpendicular to Aptakisic Road, to reduce the prominence of the rental trucks from the roadway. **Village Planner Robles** clarified the site plan contained in the presentation packet had been revised to provide the five additional parking spaces and relocate the ADA accessible space to address Staff's recommendation numbers three and four, as noted in the memorandum. He continued, U-Haul also proposed to re-grade the existing six foot tall berm fronting Aptakisc Road to a three foot tall berm to open visibility into the site. The current berm runs along Aptakisic Road and continues south along the west property line of the neighboring residential property. As a result of the proposed reduction, landscape screening of the parking lot was now required by Code. 44 "gro-low sumac" shrubs were proposed, which **Village Planner Robles** explained would not comply with code requirements. Staff recommended the western portion of the berm remain to provide suitable screening from the adjacent residence to the west, which was also supported by the Zoning Board during their review of the Special Use amendment. Additionally, Staff recommended the landscape plan be revised to provide landscaping compliant with Village Code.

**Village Planner Robles** concluded that Staff was recommending approval of the proposed modifications to the site, subject to the recommendations in the Staff memo, excluding Items #3 and #4, as such were addressed through a site plan revision.

**Heather Skelton**, U-Haul, concurred with **Village Planner Robles'** summary of the proposal and explained the berm reduction was the deciding factor in U-Haul's purchase of the property. She continued, 11 existing trees along the berm were proposed for removal and would be replaced with 14 new trees per the provided landscape plan within the presentation packet. **Ms. Skelton** also agreed to the removal of the existing detached structures on the site prior to occupancy.

**Member Hardnock** questioned if all existing trees on the property were proposed for removal. **Ms. Skelton** indicated that a handful of trees were being preserved at the east and west corners of the property, along Aptakisic Road. **Village Planner**



**Robles** elaborated on the proposed regarding of the berm and verified the trees to remain per the provided landscape plan.

**Chairman Grover** indicated his support of keeping the berm along the west property line. **Ms. Skelton** voiced her willingness to keep the berm intact to the west.

In regards to the proposed landscaping along the parking lot and truck rental parking spaces fronting Aptakisic Road, **Member Kennerley** agreed with Staff's recommendation that a single row of evergreen shrubs was not sufficient and expressed the need to add height and variety.

**Member Gulatee** noted his support of the berm reduction and the angled truck rental parking spaces. He questioned if **Ms. Skelton** was in agreement with Staff's recommendation to pave the gravel parking areas. **Ms. Skelton** indicated that U-Haul may not be in a position to perform the paving work within the first 30-60 days of occupancy, and may have to wait until the U-Haul operation turns a profit at the site. **Member Gulatee** also questioned if there were any plans to improve the building's exterior. **Ms. Skelton** explained many of the site improvements would be along the street frontage and within the building's interior. U-Haul's long-term vision for the site is to construct a purpose-built self-storage facility, but the company has not established any specifics at the moment.

There being no further comment, **Chairman Grover** sought a motion for ARB consideration.

*Member Gulatee moved and Member Hardnock seconded a motion to approve and recommend to the Village Board for their approval of modifications to the approved site plan, building elevations, and landscape plan approved by Special Use Ordinance 78-533-23 for a proposed U-Haul facility located at 200 Industrial Drive, subject to the following conditions:*

- 1. Vehicular area north of the building be paved with concrete, asphaltic materials or permanent materials, in accordance with the Off-Street Parking regulations.*
- 2. Existing detached structures be removed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.*
- 3. The existing berm adjacent to the west property line shall remain.*
- 4. The landscape Plan shall be revised to provide landscaping compliant with Section 13-2-1(C)(3) of the Village Code*

*The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.*

- 3.3 PUBLIC HEARING regarding text amendments to various sections of Title 12, Sign Control, of the Lincolnshire Village Code, to revise and clarify requirements for permanent and temporary signs (Village of Lincolnshire).

**Chairman Grover** recessed the ARB meeting and convened the Public Hearing.



**Economic Development Coordinator Zozulya** stated the current and most recent Sign Code rewrite was adopted in June of 2009. She noted since that time, a number of revisions regarding temporary signs, landscaping and others have been approved that clarify or refine code requirements as Staff learned of inconsistencies or regulations that did not work in the field as anticipated. In the summer of 2014 staff discussed with the Village Board challenges and opportunities facing Lincolnshire's shopping centers and signage was noted as a crucial element for the Village's economic development efforts. The discussion resulted in the Village Board referring to the ARB potential Sign Code revisions for review and recommendation. **Economic Development Coordinator Zozulya** stated staff reviewed the current Sign Code and identified 19 topic areas that have either arisen as an issue or are anticipated to cause difficulty for businesses. Staff also conducted a survey of local communities through the Northwest Municipal Conference. The public hearing was properly noticed in the Lincolnshire Review.

**Economic Development Coordinator Zozulya** asked the ARB whether they would like staff to review each topic area proposed for revision item by item or whether they would like to focus on the most complex areas where they have questions or concerns.

It was the consensus of the ARB to focus on those areas of revision that require discussion.

**Economic Development Coordinator Zozulya** stated the first area of proposed revisions is multi-tenant ground signs. She noted during a recent business roundtable meeting a business representative inquired whether the Sign Code can be further relaxed to allow more than 4 tenant panels on a single ground sign. **Economic Development Coordinator Zozulya** stated there are two examples in the Village where a ground sign has 4 tenant panels: Millbrook Business Center and Spectrum Office Center with both centers housing multiple tenants. The ARB determined the existing permissibility of up to 4 tenant panels should be maintained, with any additional panels to be reviewed by the ARB as part of a variation request.

**Economic Development Coordinator Zozulya** noted the next area of revision is multi-tenant wall signs in office and office/industrial zoning districts in the Village. The current Code allows wall signs for multi-tenant commercial buildings while explicitly prohibiting wall signs for multi-tenant office buildings. No reference is made to multi-tenant industrial signs, making them prohibited. The Village's Zoning Code was recently amended to allow multi-tenancy in office and industrial buildings regardless of the building size. As more buildings can now be subdivided for more than one tenant, the ARB should determine whether the Code needs to be revised to allow wall signs for multi-tenant office and industrial buildings (in addition to commercial wall signs which are already permitted). If so, a determination should be made regarding whether or not such signs should be allowed with any restrictions tied to the building frontage or other factors to balance the need for tenant identification with building aesthetics.



The ARB noted their willingness to change the Code to allow permissibility of multi-tenant wall signs in office and office/industrial districts based on the building frontage, tenant entrances, etc.

They directed staff to research this item further and bring staff recommendations to the ARB for review. **Economic Development Coordinator Zozulya** noted staff will survey local communities regarding this matter as this was not included in the original survey given the timing of the multi-tenancy code amendment.

**Economic Development Coordinator Zozulya** asked the ARB whether they are interested in allowing exposed neon signs in commercial areas which are currently prohibited. She noted no requests for such signs have been received as commercial businesses have been using neon-like (not exposed) “open” signs that have a similar appearance and are as effective as exposed neon signs.

It was the consensus of the ARB to leave the Code unchanged with regard to the prohibition of neon signs.

**Economic Development Coordinator Zozulya** stated the Sign Code prohibits balloon signs. Several communities surveyed allow them for special events. Staff proposes no more than 5 balloons, each limited to 9 square feet in area and displayed no higher than 8’ from grade, be permitted per business in conjunction with special events. She asked the ARB whether they find the regulations proposed reasonable.

**Member Kennerley** stated she is comfortable with the proposal but would recommend allowing balloon display during normal business hours and require balloons be taken inside and placed back out the next day if the special event takes more than one day. **Economic Development Coordinator Zozulya** stated it has been staff’s experience the vast majority of special events last one day only. She noted staff’s agreement to incorporate the ARB’s suggestion into the draft.

**Economic Development Coordinator Zozulya** asked the ARB if they feel the current temporary sign allowance of 90 days per calendar year is sufficient. She noted staff has not encountered cases where businesses have depleted their annual allotment and expressed a desire for more days. There are only a handful of businesses and non-profits in the Village that are regular users of temporary signage. In other communities that responded to the survey the maximum number of days permitted for temporary sign display varies from 30-180 days per year.

It was the consensus of the ARB to leave the Code unchanged with regard to the allowable temporary sign display period.

**Member Gulatee** inquired whether staff consulted with local real estate agents regarding the size of residential real estate signs they want to see allowed by Code. **Economic Development Coordinator Zozulya** noted staff did not see the need to contact them directly as the sample of signs in the field staff analyzed gave a good understanding of current practices among several real estate companies active in Lincolnshire.





*With no further comments from the ARB and staff, the ARB decided to continue the public hearing on the Sign Code until the regularly scheduled ARB meeting on February 17, 2015, to allow staff the opportunity to develop code language regarding multi-tenant wall signs in office and office/industrial zoning districts for the ARB's consideration.*

**Village Planner Robles** requested the ARB table Item 3.4 and proceed to Item 3.5, as the Zoning Board was awaiting the ARB's input of the code revisions related to Item 3.5 before conducting a public hearing.

3.5 Consideration and Discussion regarding Text Amendments to Chapter 2, Definitions, and Chapter 11, Off-Street Parking and Loading, of Title 6 – Zoning of the Lincolnshire Village Code, regarding updates to the Village's off-street parking and loading regulations (Village of Lincolnshire)

**Village Planner Robles** presented that Staff has conducted a comprehensive review of parking requirements to determine appropriate parking demands for today's uses to recommend appropriate revisions where necessary. While revisions to the Zoning Code are typically reviewed by the Zoning Board, **Village Planner Robles** explained that as off-street parking facilities were often part of ARB site plan review, the Zoning Board requested the proposed text amendments be reviewed by the ARB. He continued to note that while the proposed revisions to the Off-Street Parking code were considerable, highlights of those areas that pertained directly to the ARB's purview of design and materials would be presented.

**Village Planner Robles** identified that the general requirements section of the Code provided overall application of parking and loading requirements for all buildings in the Village. Only minor updates are proposed, with the biggest addition being the inclusion of provisions for snow removal to ensure storage areas are identified on site plans and to discourage snow storage within landscaped areas. He continued, that within the general requirements section is a surfacing subsection that currently required all parking spaces to be improved with asphalt, concrete, or similar all weather, dustless material. However, the use of impervious surfaces has significant environmental impacts on local stormwater management and water and wildlife habitat quality. **Village Planner Robles** explained that there were minimal opportunities to incentivize green parking through Village Codes and permitting requirements. Therefore, in an effort to moderate parking facilities in excess of code requirements, Staff proposed that parking facilities that exceeded the minimum code required spaces would be required to be constructed of alternate paving materials and incorporate stormwater best management practice (BMP) techniques.

Continuing with the general requirements for parking facilities, **Village Planner Robles** explained the proposed revisions to the screening and landscaping subsection. He elaborated that all parking facilities with three or more spaces currently required specific screening and landscaping. Staff proposed to relocate parking lot landscaping requirements to the Village's Landscaping Code for consistency, which was also undergoing revisions. Parking lot screening had been significantly revised by establishing two categories; 1) residential zoning districts,



and 2) non-residential zoning districts, with regulations appropriate for each type of parking lot. Landscaping for parking lot islands had also been added into the draft code language to ensure adequate landscaping is provided.

**Village Planner Robles** continued with the design and maintenance subsection within the general requirements and noted that Staff had retained the existing regulations requiring curbing for all parking lots, drives, access roadways, and parking lot islands. However, with the inclusion of stormwater BMP techniques, an exemption from the curbing requirements had been added if the absence of curbing is essential to the design and implementation of such BMP's. Additional regulations were also included to require adequate vehicle overhang if adjacent to a curbed island or sidewalk to ensure vehicles did not obstruct pedestrian access along the adjacent sidewalks. **Village Planner Robles** concluded that a substantial number of other code revisions were proposed; however, such were related to required parking ratios to be considered by the Zoning Board.

**Member Gulatee** pronounced that he believed there was a way to incentivize green parking lots in that a developer could reduce the size of stormwater detention ponds by installing green parking facilities. A reduction in detention ponds would amount to more land for development for the developer. **Village Planner Robles** agreed with **Member Gulatee's** statement; however, he noted that it has been Staff's experience that developer's prefer to construct larger stormwater detention ponds in order to provide traditional surface parking facilities. Further, he explained based on Staff's research, green parking lots require a change in the culture of constructing a parking lot all the way to maintaining the lot. An example by **Village Planner Robles** was given that if permeable pavers or grass-crete materials were used, the snow removal contractor would need to know that the plow blade must be raised a few inches above the surface to prevent damage to the surface materials. If such was not done, damage would occur and result in added maintenance expense that property owner's and/or developers are not willing to incur over a traditional impervious lot.

**Chairman Grover** suggested placing a minimum threshold, such as 10%, on parking spaces that exceeded the minimum required by Code based on the proposed requirement to construct excess parking utilizing BMP's. He elaborated that if a property owner exceeded the minimum parking totals by two spaces, it would be impractical to expect the two additional spaces to be "green". **Village Planner Robles** concurred and noted additional language would be incorporated in the draft code based on the suggestion.

**Member Gulatee** sought further information regarding parking ratios given the recent parking deck proposal at the Tri-State International Office Center, which was a result of increased staff occupancies within an existing office building. **Village Planner Robles** elaborated that there are two typical methods for parking requirements, minimum ratios and maximum ratios, with the Village following the minimum parking ratio approach. In regards to parking for office uses, after research, Staff recommended retaining the minimum ratio approach and the existing parking requirements for office uses. He explained that while some office



uses may need additional parking based on increased occupancies, there was nothing within the proposed Code preventing an office from providing excess parking. **Village Planner Robles** noted Staff was cautious to make an impulsive increase in parking requirements based on one request, which would result in larger parking lots and impervious surfaces within the Village.

There being no further comments, **Chairman Grover** closed the ARB's discussion on this Item.

3.4 CONTINUED Consideration and Discussion regarding text amendments to Chapter 2 of Title 13, Landscaping, of the Lincolnshire Village Code to revise and update the Village's landscaping requirements (Village of Lincolnshire).

This agenda item was continued to the February 17, 2015 ARB meeting to allow additional ARB review of draft regulations prior to discussion.

**4.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS (None)**  
**6.0 NEW BUSINESS**

**Community & Economic Director McNellis** expressed that the Village is seeking interested residents to serve on the ARB and the other Advisory Boards. If the ARB knows of any interested persons, they are encouraged to submit an application for the Mayor's Talent Bank.

**Chairman Grover** expressed gratitude and thanks to former ARB member Peter Schlecht for his time served as an ARB member.

**7.0 CITIZENS COMMENTS (None)**  
**8.0 ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, **Chairman Grover** requested an adjournment, to which all members agreed. The meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Stephen Robles, Village Planner and Tonya Zozulya, Economic Development Coordinator.